

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No
PCT/IL2005/000071

International filing date (day/month/year)
20.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
26.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H01R25/00, H01R31/02

Applicant
HASID, Noa

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No II Priority
- ☐ Box No III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis 1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66 1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Chelbosu, L

Telephone No +49 89 2399-6974



Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

- 1 ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has:
- ☐ paid additional fees
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest.
 - ☐ not paid additional fees.
2. ☒ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
 - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:
see separate sheet
4. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☒ all parts.
 - ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos.

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	7
	No: Claims	1-6,8-21
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-21
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-21
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

10/587211
IAP11 Rec'd PCT/PTO 25 JUL 2006

Re Item IV.

The separate inventions/groups of inventions are:

1-20

A multi-socket assembly with a plug unit and at least one socket unit said assembly being formed as an integral insulating body

21

A multi-socket assembly with a plug unit and a plurality of socket units wherein adjacent socket units of said plurality of socket units are flexibly connected one to the other

They are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (Rule 13.1 PCT) for the following reasons:

The definitions of the different claimed inventions are only intended to identify said inventions in a concise manner. They may well, as such, comprise terms or generalisations which upon a close analysis could be found to extend the defined subject-matter beyond the contents of the applications as filed.

The "special technical features", as defined in Rule 13.2 PCT, of the first invention/group of inventions, which are intended to be a contribution over the prior art, i.e. the assembly is formed as an integral insulating body, apparently solve the problem of providing a multi-socket assembly with a stabile configuration.

The "special technical features", as defined in Rule 13.2 PCT, of the second invention/group of inventions, which are intended to be a contribution over the prior art, i.e. adjacent socket units of the plurality of socket units are flexibly connected one to the other, apparently solve the problem of providing a multi-socket assembly with a flexible configuration.

No same or similar special technical features can be determined and different underlying problems are solved.

A common concept linking together inventions/groups of invention 1 and 2 is

a multi-socket assembly comprising a plug unit operatively connected to at least one socket unit.

This common concept is disclosed in each of documents D1-D6 and thus, it is not novel.

It is clear that the two claimed inventions/groups of inventions can be applied independently of each other, i.e. they are not necessarily inter-related. The requisite unity of invention (Rule 13.1 PCT) therefore no longer exists inasmuch as a technical relationship involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features in the sense of Rule 13.2 PCT does not exist between the subject-matter of the above mentioned groups of dependent claims.

IAP11 Rec'd PCT/PTO 25 JUL 2006**Re Item V****Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. STATE OF THE ART**

Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: DE 92 12 997 U1 (HELMUT H. LEHMANN GMBH, 6350 BAD NAUHEIM, DE) 3 December 1992
- D2: DE 297 05 946 U1 (JANSEN, JOHANNES H., 82223 EICHENAU, DE) 5 June 1997
- D3: GB-A-2 350 493 (DAVID JOYNER) 29 November 2000
- D4: US-A-5 788 521 (MILAN ET AL) 4 August 1998
- D5: WO 03/105287 A (BERNO, LUCA) 18 December 2003
- D6: EP-A-1 139 512 (VIMAR SPA) 4 October 2001
- D7: US-A-3 527 933 (HELMUT THUMMEL) 8 September 1970
- D8: DE 101 39 202 A1 (PHOENIX CONTACT GMBH & CO KG) 13 March 2003

2. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS**2.1 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1**

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A multi-socket assembly (see each of figures 1 and 2) comprising a plug unit (figure 1, reference 3) operatively connected to at least one socket unit (figure 1, reference 2)

wherein

the assembly is formed as an integral body (figure 1, reference 1) comprising at

least one suitable electrically insulating material that encapsulates the electrical connections between said plug unit and said at least one socket unit.

Therefore, the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new.

Furthermore, the subject-matter of claim 1 is also disclosed in each of documents D2-D6 (see the corresponding passages cited in The International Search Report).

2.2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 21

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 21 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

a multi-socket assembly (see each of figures 1 and 2) comprising a plug unit (figure 1, reference 3) operatively connected to a plurality of socket units (figure 1, references 2,5)

wherein

adjacent socket units (figure 1, references 2 and 5) of said plurality of socket units are flexibly connected one to the other (see in each of figures 1 and 2 the cable with reference 4).

Therefore, the subject-matter of claim 21 is not new.

Furthermore, the subject-matter of claim 21 is also disclosed in each of documents D2 and D3 (see the corresponding passages cited in The International Search Report).

3. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Dependent claims 2-20 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT):

3.1 Claims 2-6 and 8-20 are not new because:

- the additional features of claims 2-6, 8, 11-16 and 20 are disclosed, for example, in document D1;
- the additional features of claims 9, 10 and 17-19 are disclosed, for example in document D4.

- 3.2 The additional feature of claim 7, namely the disc shape, is merely one of several straightforward design possibilities from which the skilled person would select, in accordance with circumstances, without the exercise of inventive skill, in order to solve the problem posed.

4. MISCELLANEOUS

It is not at present apparent which part of the application could serve as a basis for a new claim which would meet the requirements of Article 33(2)-(4) PCT. Should the applicant nevertheless regard some particular matter as meeting the requirements of Article 33(2)-(4) PCT, the new independent claim should be filed.

Furthermore, when filing a new set of claims, the applicant should take into account also the following remarks:

- In order to meet the requirements of Rule 5.1(a) PCT, documents representing the prior art should be acknowledged in the description and also the description should disclose the invention as claimed.
- When the applicant files a new set of claims he should bring the description in conformity with the claims as required by Rule 5.1(a)(iii) PCT.
- The features of the claims should be provided with reference signs placed in parentheses [Rule 6.2(b) PCT].
- Disclosing "*said socket units*" claim 5 lacks clarity since claim 1 discloses "*at least one socket unit*".
- It seems that in claim 18 a typing error is made: since said claim discloses "*said indicator*", it seems that it should be read "*according to claim 17*" instead "*according to claim 1*".